

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 DAMON CHARLES WILLIAMS,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 PRK FUNDING SERVICES, INC., *et al.*,

12 Defendants.

CASE NO. C18-48RSM

MINUTE ORDER STRIKING
PLAINTIFF'S RECENT FILINGS

13
14 The following MINUTE ORDER is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable
15 Ricardo S. Martinez, Chief United States District Judge:

16 Plaintiff has recently filed several documents that are all procedurally improper. Dkts.
17 #153, #154, #155, #156, and #157. The first few were easily disregarded as irrelevant. However,
18 Plaintiff continues to improperly file documents. Accordingly, and for the reasons below, the
19 Court STRIKES each.

20
21 On November 4, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Judicial Notice of Relevant Facts Under Fed. R.
22 Evid. Rule 201 ("Judicial Notice"). Dkt. #153. The Judicial Notice apparently seeks to add
23 evidence to the record. Plaintiff does not indicate what filing the Judicial Notice supports and
24 does not provide any legal basis for the filing. The Court STRIKES Plaintiff's Judicial Notice
25 as procedurally improper and has not considered it.
26
27

1 On November 14, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Declaration of Damon Charles Williams
2 (“Declaration”). Dkt. #154. Plaintiff’s Declaration seeks to add evidence to the record, but does
3 not identify what filing it supports, why it is timely, or why it is relevant. Plaintiff provides no
4 legal basis for the filing and does not seek leave of the Court. Accordingly, the Court STRIKES
5 the Declaration as procedurally improper and has not considered it.

6 On December 5, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to Compel Response
7 to Subpoena (“Motion to Compel”). Dkt. #155. That filing seeks to compel compliance with a
8 subpoena presumably issued by Plaintiff pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45. Pro se
9 parties may not issue subpoenas without the subpoenas being issued by the Clerk. Fed. R. Civ.
10 P. 45(a)(4). Those subpoenas are issued under the signature of the Clerk. *Id.* Plaintiff’s Motion
11 to Compel does not attach the subpoena, does not provide proof that the subpoena was properly
12 served, and does not demonstrate that the subpoena—if lawful—is properly enforced in this
13 District. Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel is procedurally improper and the Court accordingly
14 STRIKES Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel.
15

16 On December 7, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Supplemental Declaration of Damon Charles
17 Williams (“Supplemental Declaration”). Dkt. #156. The Supplemental Declaration attempts to
18 enter “discovered evidence in the form of email correspondence.” *Id.* Plaintiff has not sought
19 leave of the Court to file the documents, does not indicate how the documents are relevant to this
20 matter, does not indicate why they are timely filed in support of any of his briefing, and provides
21 no legal authority allowing his filing. Accordingly, the Court STRIKES Plaintiff’s Supplemental
22 Declaration as procedurally improper and has not considered it.
23

24 On December 13, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Writ of Conventional Mandamus (“Writ”). Dkt.
25 #157. The purpose of this filing is unclear to the Court and the Court is concerned that it
26
27

1 materially misrepresents the record. Plaintiff's Motion for Expungement (Dkt. #116) remains
2 pending and has not been granted. The Court will interpret the Writ as an untimely and
3 unrequested supplement to Plaintiff's proposed Order Granting Motion to Direct Expungement
4 (Dkt. #116-2). The Writ is procedurally improper and the Court accordingly STRIKES the Writ.

5 DATED this 17 day of December, 2018.

6
7 WILLIAM McCOOL, Clerk

8 By: /s/ Paula McNabb
9 Deputy Clerk
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27